

Suite 210 1800 Glenarm Place Denver, CO 80202 Tel: 303.294.0427

Fax: 303.293.2235

October 21, 1999

Mr. D. Wayne Hedberg
Permit Supervisor
Minerals Regulatory Program
State of Utah
Division of Oil, Gas and Mining
1594 West North Temple, Suite 1210
Salt LakeCity, Utah, 84114



Re: Notice of Non-Compliance, North Lily Mining Company, Tintic Project M/023/007, Juab County, Utah dated October 12, 1999

Dear Mr. Hedberg;

Your letter of Non-Compliance was received with concern and disappointment. North Lily Mining Company has always attempted to operate in a responsible manner, and in accord with applicable regulations, rules, stipulations, and permit conditions. Prior to receipt of your letter, we believed that North Lily maintained a good, cooperative working relationship with DOGM and had been responsive to the concerns of your group. During this period of unfavorable business conditions, North Lily has successfully reclaimed disturbance from our mining operations and we have been released from further obligation for these (Tom Munson letter dated June 3, 1998).

The company has made good progress toward closure and reclamation of the Silver City heap leach facility with a closure plan approved by Division of Water Quality, and heap grading and burial of solution return piping having been completed to date. The remaining tasks include: DWQ approval of the design of a biopass system, construction of the biopass system, final grading of the heap to repair minor areas of slumping, removal of surface facilities, disposal of solutions, placement of top soil and seeding. It was the company's intention to complete these tasks during the summer and fall of 1999.

In the spring of 1999, a qualified firm was retained to conduct feasibility studies regarding the biopass system design. In their final feasibility report, the contractor stated: "Using data generated in the column testing, Compliance Technology, Inc. can design a full-scale system for treating the drain down of the Silver City heap leach pad." North Lily learned that the contractor was no longer in business when it called the contractor in

August to discuss the feasibility report and to commission the design studies, which would have been forwarded to DWQ for review and approval.

Because it was not possible to retain a replacement contractor, complete necessary studies, design the biopass system, gain DWQ's approval and construct the system in 1999, North Lily immediately began intensive efforts to lessen the effluent inventory by installation of additional misters and sprinklers. These efforts have been successful with effluent volumes being reduced approximately 25% to about 700,000 gallons from August 18, 1999 to September 9, 1999. In order to provide an additional factor of safety in effluent management, North Lily's consultant, Tom Gast, requested permission of your group and DWQ to land dispose of 1 to 1.5 acre feet of heap effluent yet this fall. Approval of that request would have drawn the effluent inventory to minimal levels. Mr. Gast's requests were denied and North Lily continues to evaporate effluent with significant reductions noted. An important observation is that as the heap was flushed with natural precipitation during the past four years, the company has noticed a meaningful decrease in metals and cyanide concentrations in effluent. TDS concentrations are declining as well, but not as rapidly.

North Lily has carefully reviewed the allegations contained in your October 12, 1999 letter. It is North Lily's belief that while DOGM's opinions stated in the letter must be addressed, a careful review of the facts does not elevate the described situations into valid "Findings of Non-Compliance". Our review follows.

### Violated rules:

1. <u>Section R647-4-107.1 Operation Practices</u> - requires the operation to minimize hazards to the public safety and welfare. Due to the presence of dead animals noted during recent staff inspections (2 dead birds and a dead sheep), the questionable water quality of the pad effluent, and the insecure nature of the site (wide open gates leading to process ponds and heap), the Division feels public safety and welfare is compromised.

North Lily maintains the facility such that it does not present a hazard to public safety and welfare. On site staff are employed and we have contracted security since 1995 to regularly check the facility during off hours. Following DOGM's verbal report of the facility gate being open without staff present, the company learned that occasionally a staff person left the facility for brief periods without locking the gate. Staff has been reminded that all gates are to be locked when they are away from the facility, no matter how briefly. We thank DOGM for pointing to the described situation and believe that the company's actions have tightened security such that the facility does not represent a hazard to public safety and welfare.

2. <u>R647-107.2. Drainages</u> – requires the operator to take appropriate measures to avoid or minimize environmental damage to natural drainage channels. To date, there have been a number of unauthorized releases of contaminated water leaving the process water ponds and traveling offsite through a culvert located west of the site and under State Highway 6 to adjacent undisturbed areas.

The company is unaware of any unauthorized releases of contaminated water leaving the process water ponds such that the releases resulted in environmental damage to natural drainage channels. There have been no releases from the process ponds since 1991 (the period of history available to current management). There was a wash out a number of years ago, while the heap was under active leach, which resulted from a broken pipe. Heap material was washed from the pad. This release was properly reported and cleaned up to the satisfaction of DOGM and DWQ. Said again, to our knowledge, there have been no releases from the ponds in the past eight years.

<u>Process Ponds</u> - Given the current deteriorated condition of the process ponds (and the volume of impounded solutions), it is doubtful these facilities will successfully retain the amount of additional effluent/runoff that may be produced when a significant precipitation event (or spring snowmelt) occurs. We believe that the capacity and integrity of these containment facilities will be breached leading to uncontrolled discharges of solutions.

It was North Lily's intention to close the facility this year and maintenance to the pond liners was deferred. Because the biopass contractor was not able to prepare a design in time to gain DWQ's approval, it became necessary to defer the final closure until next year. Once North Lily learned of this, the company began to aggressively evaporate effluent and to repair the pond liners. The company also requested DOGM and DWQ approval to land apply 1.0 to 1.5 acre feet of effluent to provide an added factor of safety. This land application requests were denied but the company continues to successfully evaporate effluent. Frankly, North Lily does not understand the basis for DOGM's contention that "it is doubtful these facilities will successfully retain the amount of additional effluent/runoff that may be produced when a significant precipitation event (or spring snowmelt) occurs" given the fact that there is less than 30% of fluids present in the system today when compared to when the facility was operating.

3. <u>R647-4-107.3. Erosion Control</u> - There is evidence of significant erosion on the heap leach pad where processed, contaminated ore has slumped blocking the solution conveyance ditches. This is causing potential environmental and heap stability problems and uncontrolled discharge of process solutions.

There is some slumping of the graded heap surface that will be repaired as a part of final grading prior to the placement of topsoil on the heap surface. Four-inch pipe was placed into certain of the solution conveyance ditches and covered with clean material per the suggestion of DWQ. This was done to prevent the ditches from clogging and not allowing effluent from flowing to the biopass system(letter dated August 21, 1996 to Dennis Frederick, DWQ with copy to Tom Munson, DOGM). It is believed that DOGM has mistakenly thought that the material in the ditches is the result of slumping rather than having been placed as part of the closure plan.

4. <u>R647-4-107.4. Deleterious Materials</u> - deleterious material (i.e. pad effluent) is potentially leaving the site by way of compromised liners both associated with the pad

and the process water ponds. The presence of several opened electrical transformers on the east side of the heap leach pad raises the question of possible PCB contamination.

As discussed above, North Lily implemented a program of maintenance to repair tears in the pond liners in September. The transformers referenced were tested in 1994 and found to be non-PCB transformers. This information, along with a copy of the PCB test results were forwarded to Wayne Hedberg by fax from Tom Gast on October 6, 1999. In the event that DOGM has not reviewed the information, another copy is included for review.

Location of Non-Compliance

The location of the site is on the east side of State Highway 6 in the NW ¼, Section 35, Township 10 South, Range 3 West, SLBM, Juab County, Utah.

The project includes the described area as well as the area on the west side of Highway 6 used for land application (see letter March 5, 1997 from Paul Spor to Dennis Frederick, DWQ with copy to Tom Munson, DOGM).

## Request for Reconsideration

North Lily Mining Company requests that DOGM carefully review the information contained in this transmittal and reconsider its Finding of Non-Compliance. In the event that DOGM determines that its Finding of Non-Compliance continues to be in order, North Lily Mining Company respectfully requests to contest the individual findings and wishes to schedule a meeting before the Associate Director and appropriate members of the Minerals Program staff. This letter serves as timely notice of our request to contest.

Please feel free to contact either Tom Gast of Environmental Management Services Company (970/461-0571) or me if additional information can be provided. It is our hope that our working relationship can be restored.

Sincerely,

W. Gene Webb

**Executive Vice President** 

Enclosure: Gast fax dated 10/6/99

Cc: Tom Gast, EMS

Dennis Frederick, DWQ

Mary Ann Wright, Associate Director, DOGM

EMS
1413 West 57th Street
Loveland, CO 80538
970/461-0571 fax 970/461-0591
e-mail: TGast99@aol.com

# facsimile transmital

То:	D. V	Wayne Hedberg		Fax:	801/359-3940	
From:	Ton	n Gast		Date:	10/6/99	
Re:	Nor	th Lily PCB Test R	esults	Pages:	4 pgs	
cc:	Stev	ve Flechner / Gene	Webb		45.	
☐ Urge	nt	X For Review	☐ Pleas	se Comment	☐ Please Reply	☐ Please Recycle

Following are the PCB test results for the transformers noted during the course of DOGM's recent inspection of the North Lily facility. Please contact me with any questions.

Tom Last

Memo To:

File

From:

Tom Gast

Date:

November 9, 1994

Subject:

Silver City PCB Test Results

Samples were obtained from the four pieces of electrical equipment stored by North Lily at Silver City on October 19, 1994. The samples were submitted to Utility Testing Laboratory of Salt Lake City and the PCB content was tested as required by EPA and Utah regulation. Samples were taken from the following pieces of equipment:

Sample No.	Serial No.	Description
NL #1	NSN	Transformer
NL #2	19590	Transformer 100 kva 2400/240-480
NL #3	NSN	Oil Switch
NL #4	19600	Transformer 100 kva 2400/240-480

Results: No PCB's were detected in samples 1, 2 or 3. Sample 4 contained 1.5 mg/kg PCB which is just above the detection limit of 1.0 mg/kg PCB.

Regulatory Effect: EPA classes PCB content as follows:

>500 ppm PCB - PCB Transformer

>50 ppm, <500 ppm PCB - PCB Contaminated Transformer

<50 ppm PCB - non-PCB Transformer

Since no PCB's were detected in samples 1, 2 or 3 and only 1.5 ppm PCB was detected in Sample 4, all four devices qualify as non-PCB transformers.

Attached you will find copies of the sample Chain of Custody list and the Laboratory Analysis data sheet. A copy of these test results is to be kept on file in Silver City for possible inspection by EPA or the State of Utah.

Please contact me with your questions.

# UTILITY TESTING LABORATORY

875 SO. CHESTNUT ST. P. O. BOX 25005 SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84125 PHONE: (801) 973-8305

OCTOBER 28, 1994

E.M.S. SUITE 103 ATTENTION: MR. TOM GAST 2301 RESEARCH BLVD. FORT COLLINS , CO 80526

SUBJECT: ORDER NO. NORTH LILY 0001 RELEASE DATE: 28 OCT 1994 PCB TESTS ON SUBJECT SAMPLES

TESTING PERFORMED PER THE FOLLOWING METHODS:

EPA METHOD 600/4-81-045 (OIL), SW846-8080 (SOIL),

AND EPA METHOD 608 (WATER)

METHOD DETECTION LIMITS:

1 mg/Kg IN OIL, 1 mg/Kg IN SOIL AND  $1\mu$ g/L IN WATER

### GENTLEMEN:

FOLLOWING ARE THE TEST RESULTS ON YOUR SUBJECT SAMPLES:

TEST NO. 10-21-94-03	OIL SAMPLE S/N NL#1(NO. LILY)	RESULT OF TEST ND
10-21-94-04	OIL SAMPLE S/N NL#2(NO. LILY)	ND
10-21-94-05	OIL SAMPLE S/N NL#3(NO. LILY)	ND
10-21-94-06	OIL SAMPLE S/N NL#4(NO. LILY)	1.5 mg/Kg (1260) PCB

UTILITY TESTING LABORATORY

D.m. Thorsen D. M. THORSEN

# Utility Testing I -44.8F

Project Number:  ***Dtility Testing Laboratory CHAIN OF CUSTODY**  ****Seach Checus Street Solidate City Laboratory Country Number:  ***Diagram Street Solidate City Laboratory Street Solidate City Laboratory Country Number:  ***Project Number: Street Solidate City Laboratory Country Number: Country Number: Street Solidate City Laboratory Country Number: Country Number: Country Country Number: Country Number: Country Number: Country Country Country Number: Country Country Number: Country Country Country Number: Country Co								
## Sumple Time   Sumple Identification   Propert Name	がの	ility Test		aborator	S	CHAIN	OF CUST	1 . 11
Project Name		875 South Chestr			ione: 801-973-8305	FAX: 801-973-8333		
Sumple Time Sample Identification  NL # 3 (NC LIV)  NL # 4 (NO LIV)  NL # 4 (NO LIV)  NL # 5 (NC LIV)  Sample Time  Received (signature)  Partitine:  Received (signature)  Received (signature)  Partitine:  Partiti	Project Number:	Project Name:		An	alysis	Report To (	print):	
Sample Time  Sample Interpretation  N.L. # (N.L. L.I.V)  Date/Time:  Received (signature)  Date/Time:  Received (signature)  Date/Time:  Received (signature)  Date/Time:  Received (signature)  # (N.L. L.I.V)  Date/Time:  Received (signature)  # (N.L. L.I.V)  Sample  Address:  Post / # (N.L. L.I.V)  Sample  Address:  Post / # (N.L. L.I.V)  Sample  Address:  Post / # (N.L. L.I.V)  Sample  Fax:  Address:  Received (signature)  Fax:  Fax:  Fax:  Fax:  Fax:  Fax:  Fax:  Address:  Fax:  Fax:  Fax:  Address:  Fax:  Fa	0001	14(11)	T /				1001	
NL # 3 (Nc L1)   Sample Identification   NL # 3 (Nc L1)     NL # 3 (Nc L1)     NL # 3 (Nc L1)     NL # 4 (No L1)     NL # 5 (No L1)     NL # 5 (No L1)     NL # 5 (No L1)     NL # 6 (No L1)     NL # 6 (No L1)     Nu # 6 (	P.O. Number:	Sampler's Signature:	162			o g		
NL # (Ne  L/V) $NL # 3 (Ne  L/V)$ $NL # 3 (Ne  L/V)$ $NL # 4 (Ne  L$	-	,	ification	14 (2.5)		cont. Matri		AARKS
N. L. & M. C. L. I. V.   N. L. & M. C. L. I. V.     N. L. & G. M. C. L. I. V.   M. C. L. I. V.     N. L. & G. M. C. L. I. V.   M. C. L. I. V.     Date/Time:   Received (signature):   SEND RESULTS TO (Company Name)     C. J. C. G. V. & S. C. L. I. V. C. J. V. & S. C. J. V. C. J. V. & S. C. J. V. C. J. V. & S. C. J. V. C. J. J. V. C. J. J. V. C. J. J. V. C. J.	-	) /# 7N	16. KIN)					
ML # 3 (No. Lily)  ML # 4 (No. Lily)  Date/Time:  Date/Time:  Date/Time:  Date/Time:  Received (signaturing)  Address:  Received (signaturing)  Sample	1.	26	6. Lily)					
Date/Time:    Date/Time:   Received (signature):   Phones:   Phone	1	M2 # 3N	6. LIN)					
Date/Time:    Received (signature)   Posterime:   Posterime	46-61-01	4 (h	O. L. N.)					
Date/Time:    Received (signature)   SEND RESULTS TO (Company Name)     C. 3C. 9   Sample   Seals I     C. 3C. 9   Sample   Seals I     C. 3C. 9   Sample   Seals I     C. 3C. 9   Sample   Samp								
Date/Time:  Date/Time:  Received (signature)  Phone:								err Vir
Date/Time:  Date/Time:  Received (signature):  Sample C. D. #38/H Sample  Sample C. D. #38/H Samp								
Date/Time:  Date/Time:  Date/Time:  Received (signature):  Date/Time:  Date/Ti							a a	
Date/Time:    Company Name   Company								
Date/Time:  Date/Time:  Date/Time:  Date/Time:  Date/Time:  Received (signature):  Date/Time:  Date/Time:  Received (signature):  Date/Time:  Received (signature):  Date/Time:  Received (signature):  Date/Time:  Date/Time:  Received (signature):  Seals 1  E. H. O.  Sample Sa								, E
Date/Time:    C. D 94   Received (signature)   SEND RESULTS TO (Company Name)								
Date/Time:  Date/Time:  Received (signature):  Phone:  Phone:  Remar  F. M. O.  Sampla  Sampla  Sampla  Fort Coll, In S. C.  Sampla  Sampla  Fort Coll, In S. C.  Seals I  E. M. O.  Sampla  Sampla  Fort Coll, In S. C.  Sampla  Fax:  Sampla  Fax:  Sampla  Fax:								
Date/Time:  Date/T								
Date/Time:  Date/Date/Time:  Date/Date/Time:  Date/Date/Date/Date/Date/Date/Date/Date/				1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1				
Date/Time: Received (signature):  Suite 103  Suite 103  Fort 00/Lins 008050  Suite 103  Suite 103  Fort 00/Lins 008050  Remarks:  Fax: $303 - 483 - 96/9$	elinquished (signature):	Date/Time:	Received (sign	jature)	SEND RESULTS TO	O (Company Name)	CONDITION	V OF SAMPI
Date/Time: Received (signature): $Address$ : To the attention of: $E$ , $\mathcal{H}$ . $\mathbb{S}$ . Seals Intact: $\mathcal{E}$ Address: $230I$ Received (signature): $230I$ Received (signature): $230I$ Received (signature): $20I$ Remarks: $10I$ Remarks: $10I$ Received (signature): $10I$ Remarks:	,	10.30-44 3.00 p.m	N/ FC	21 rounds of	2	0.4967	Samples Chilled:	□ Yes
Date/Time: Received (signature): Address: Research $Blod$ . Samples Preserved: $\frac{3301}{500}$ Remarks: $\frac{Fort}{100}$ Remarks: $\frac{Fort}{100}$ Phone: $\frac{Fort}{100}$ Remarks:	elinquished (signature):	Date/Time:	Received (sign	ature), "{	To the attention of: $E$ , $\mathcal{H}$ . $\mathbb{S}$ .		Seals Intact:	
Date/Time: Received (signature) FOr the Phone: 303	elinquished (signature):	Date/Time:	Received (sign	ature	· .	arch Blod.	Samples Preserved: Remarks:	
	(elinquished (signature):	Date/Time:	Received (sign	ature	~ 1 ' 1	75 (U 8052) - 9624		
	COMMENTS:				Fax: 30.3-482-	6196		

Steve and Gene;

EMS 1413 West 57<sup>th</sup> Street Loveland, CO 80538 970/461-0571 fax 970/461-0591 e-mail: TGast99@aol.com

# facsimile transmittal

□ Urge	nt	X For Review	☐ Please Comment	☐ Please Reply	☐ Please Recycle
CC:	David City Nov				
Re:			Pages:	10 Apgs	
From:	Ton	ı Gast	Date:	10/21/99	
To:	Stev	e Flechner	Fax:	520 / 882-4100	

I finally was able to speak with Paul Spor. He informed me that there have been no releases from the process ponds since he started with the project in 1991. He did provide details of a wash out which was reported, cleaned up and may explain the sediment in the NOV.

If you choose to send this; the fax numbers are:

D. Wayne Hedberg and Mary Ann Wright 801 / 359 – 3940

Dennis Frederick 801 / 538 - 6016